## Evaluating CI Activities

#### **Description**

Part of being accountable is being consciously aware of the impact we have. Each of us has a responsibility to regularly take stock of how we are doing. EPA's Public Involvement Policy emphasizes this by making evaluation one of the seven key components of an effective community involvement program. Evaluation is important because unless we assess the effect or impact of what we do, we will not know whether our efforts are adding value or making a real difference. Evaluation does not have to be complicated or resource intensive. It can be as simple as asking for feedback on the process and substance of some involvement activity. This can be done through written surveys, interviews or focus groups. From time to time, more sophisticated evaluations may help provide new perspectives that can lead to improved processes and greater public satisfaction and impact.

The Community Involvement and Outreach Branch (CIOB) within the Office of Superfund Remediation and Technology Innovation has a written survey (Attachment 1) for assessing community member satisfaction with Superfund involvement efforts. The survey focuses on 1) information and outreach, 2) the level of concern about adverse impacts caused by the site, 3) opportunities for input, and 4) EPA response to input. CIOB has a standard protocol for administering the survey to people on the site mailing list as well as a random sample of people living in the community. CIOB does most of the work of organizing and conducting the survey, which takes about three months to complete. The only cost to the region is about two days worth of staff consultation and product review time, spread over those three months.

The Agency's Public Involvement Improvement Council (PIIC) has developed a series of feedback questionnaires that everyone is free to use. The questionnaires cover the following activities:

- Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meetings and Overall Process
- Federal Advisory Commission Act Meetings and Overall Process
- Focus Groups (called Listening Sessions)
- Negotiation Processes
- Public Hearings
- Public Meetings
- Small Group Discussions

For each of these areas, there is 1) a one page user's guide that describes what is available, 2) a background piece which describes the activity and the associated feedback questionnaires, 3) a checklist to remind you of the steps to take to prepare for and collect the feedback, and 4) one or more feedback questionnaires. Attachment 2 includes a set of evaluation materials for Community Advisory Groups.

#### Required Activity?

No.

See Focus Groups, Tab 17

See Community
Involvement
Impact Analysis, Tab 6

See Community
Groups, Tab 4



See Public Meetings, Tab 32

Last Updated: September 2005

## Evaluating CI Activities

#### Making it Work

#### When to use

Neither the CIOB community survey nor the PIIC questionnaires are difficult or time-consuming to use.

Conducting a CIOB community satisfaction survey makes the most sense midway through the site cleanup. By this time the community will have a reasonable amount of involvement experience upon which to assess how you are doing. And you will be able to use the results to make appropriate adjustments to the way you will do involvement during the remainder of the cleanup. Organizing the survey takes about a month so you need to plan ahead. You will want to publicize the effort to help ensure a good response rate and you also will want to do it at a time when you believe most people will be paying attention and be willing to fill the survey out (e.g. it may not be good to do over a holiday period or during peak summer vacation time).

The PIIC feedback questionnaires should be a regular part of your community involvement efforts. You should routinely use the relevant questionnaires after all important activities. If you have a CAG at your site, once a year you should do the process assessment to determine how things are going and what may need to be improved.

#### How to Use

The CIOB community satisfaction survey is managed from Headquarters. If you are interested in having a survey done in one of your communities, please contact your regional coordinator in CIOB.

Anyone in the Agency can use the PIIC questionnaires for a relevant purpose at any time. Keep in mind that, because they are OMB approved, they must be used as is. You cannot add or subtract questions. The Agency has a responsibility to report back to OMB on the overall usage of these questionnaires. Therefore, you should keep track of how many instances you use each one and how many individuals fill them out in each instance. Every six months you should pass this information onto the person who is identified in the user's guide packages. You can find all of the questionnaires and associated materials at http://www.epa.gov/stakeholders/feedback/index.html.

#### Tips

- Your regional coordinator in CIOB is ready and willing to help you get started or answer any questions you might have about the evaluation tools.
- Get in the habit of using the feedback questionnaires on a fairly regular basis. This will help you to stay on top of things and anticipate potential concerns.
- Asking for feedback and acting on the results is a concrete demonstration that you are genuinely interested in what the community thinks and that you want to achieve a first class involvement effort.

#### Related Tools/Resources in the Toolkit

- Community Groups, Tab 4
- Community Involvement Impact Analysis, Tab 6
- Focus Groups, Tab 17

#### ATTACHMENT 1: Sample CIOB Survey Form

**OMB Control No: 2050-0096** 



# What Do You Think About EPA's Community Involvement Efforts at the \_\_\_\_Superfund Site?

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is investigating possible releases of <u>name of contaminant</u> at the \_\_\_\_\_\_ Superfund site in your community. EPA believes the active, meaningful involvement of community members is critical to the success of a cleanup effort. Your views are important and will help us be more responsive to your needs and interests.

This survey is an opportunity for you to tell us how well we are doing at listening to your concerns about the cleanup and making it possible for you to participate in the planning and decision making process. Please take a few minutes to answer the questions by placing an "x" in the appropriate box. Use the stamped envelope provided to return this form to our contractors.



Sample Picture **Any Town, Any State** 

Sample Picture

Any Town, Any State

**OMB Control No: 2050-0096** 

How do you rate EPA at each of the following?  a. Providing the information you need b. Giving you accurate information c. Making the information easy to understand d. Earning your trust e. Making it easy to get involved f. Understanding your concerns g. Responding to your concerns h. Treating you courteously i. Having a fair decision making process j. Using your input k. Explaining decisions l. Cleaning up the site	Very Bad 1 1	2000000000000	300000000000	<u> </u>	5000000000000	Very Good 6 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Before cleanup of the site began, how concerned were you about the site being harmful to each of the following?  a. My family's health b. The environment c. Property values d. Jobs in the community e. Business in the community	Not at a Concerne		3 	40000	5	Very Concerned 6 1
How concerned are you about the site being harmful to each of the following once the cleanup is finished?  a. My family's health b. The environment c. Property values d. Jobs in the community e. Business in the community	Not at all Concerned		3 	4	5 	Very concerned 6 1
How have you learned about the site? (Check all that apply  EPA mailings (other than this survey)  Newspaper articles  Radio or TV news  Community member  Family or friends  EPA's web page  Public meeting or information session held by EPA  Direct conversation with someone from EPA  Information about the site is "common knowledge"  Know someone who worked at the site  Participation in one or more citizen groups	y)					

**OMB Control No: 2050-0096** 

How would you prefer to receive site information  Monthly "News Brief" — project updates, cont Short (1-2 pages), very focused (issue-specific) in Longer, general informational mailings, sent perio Newspaper articles Radio or TV news A knowledgeable person in your community The EPA web site Short, very focused meetings, held frequently Longer, general informational meetings, held perio A direct conversation with an EPA representative	acts, calendar of even nailings, sent frequent dically odically	ts and			nts	
Presentations at local clubs and organizations Other  How interested are you in obtaining information about the following topics?  a. EPA's Superfund program b. Toxic wastes at the site		2	3	4	Inte	Very erested 6
<ul> <li>c. How the site might affect human health</li> <li>d. How the site might affect the environment</li> <li>e. Site cleanup decisions</li> <li>f. Other</li></ul>	(Check the one you)			000000		
Through opportunities for you to give written con Through public meetings where you can voice you Through opportunities for you to meet and talk in Through a toll free telephone number you can can Through a community group which discusses is Through opportunities for you to talk with indep Through a web site for you to communicate with Other	nments our comments nformally with EPA sta ll with your comments sues and concerns with endent experts n us	ıff				
Please tell us whether you have ever:  a. Provided information to EPA about the site and its b. Expressed your concerns about the site to EPA c. Offered suggestions to EPA about how the site she d. Given comments to EPA on things that they have note. Requested information from EPA about the site.  If "NO" to any of the above, why not?	ould be cleaned up	lic rev	iew		Yes	No

**OMB Control No: 2050-0096** 

9	Can you accept the decisions EPA has made so far about the site cleanup?  Yes No I am not aware of any decisions EPA has made
10	Is there anything else you would like to tell us about EPA's community involvement efforts or about this cleanup project?
	Thank you for taking the time to share your views with us!

This survey is being conducted in accordance with the Federal Paperwork Reduction Act Information Collection Request #1463.05. You will need about 15 minutes to answer the questions.

EPA estimates the individual burden for completing this survey to be 15 minutes. On average there will be about 300 respondents to the survey, for an overall public reporting burden of 75 hours.

Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR Part 9 and 48 CFR Chapter 15.

Send comments on the Agency's need for this information, the accuracy of the provided burden estimates, and any suggested methods for minimizing respondent burden, including through the use of automated collection techniques, to the Director, Collection Strategies Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2822), 1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20460; and to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, 725 17th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20503, Attention: Desk Officer for EPA. Include the EPA ICR number and OMB control number in any correspondence.

#### ATTACHMENT 2: PIIC CAG FEEdback Instructions and Questionnaires

## Assessing EPA-supported Community Advisory Groups A User's Guide with Questionnaires

Enclosed are information and tools for EPA staff to use in generating feedback on the effectiveness of Community Advisory Groups (CAGs). Specifically, this user guide contains the following:

- ✓ Background information for EPA Staff
- ✓ Checklist for Administering Questionnaires and Using Results
- Questionnaire for Feedback on the Effectiveness of a CAG Meeting (participant assessment)
- ✓ Questionnaire for Feedback on the Effectiveness of a CAG Meeting (EPA/contractor assessment)
- Questionnaire for Feedback on the Overall Effectiveness of a CAG Process (participant assessment)
- ✓ Questionnaire for Feedback on the Overall Effectiveness of a CAG Process (EPA/contractor assessment)

For questions contact:

Patricia Bonner (bonner.patricia@epa.gov)/202-566-2204

DRAFT: Last Updated 6/28/04

## Assessing EPA's Community Advisory Groups Background Information for EPA Staff

#### Introduction

Enclosed are four questionnaires for EPA staff to use in generating feedback on the effectiveness of EPA-supported (and other) community advisory groups (CAGs). The questionnaires are a component of the evaluation section in the *Framework for Implementing EPA's Public Involvement Policy*. The questionnaires are for people who regularly attend CAG meetings and for EPA staff responsible for coordinating the work of a CAG. The *first and second questionnaires* (one for CAG participants and one for EPA/contractor staff) focus on the effectiveness of specific CAG meetings. The *third questionnaire*, which should be administered once or twice a year as needed, deals with CAG participant perspectives on the CAG's success. The *fourth questionnaire*, which should be administered once or twice a year as needed, deals with Agency/contractor perspectives on the CAG's success.

#### What is a community advisory group?

A CAG is made up of diverse representatives from a community. Its purpose is to provide a public forum for discussing the interests and concerns the community has about some project or set of actions. CAG members meet on a regular basis to learn about project plans and activities and to offer ideas and suggestions to the project sponsor. A CAG may be self-facilitated or use an outside professional. It is not EPA sponsored and it is not subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act procedures.

#### How can the CAG questionnaires be useful to you?

Use of the questionnaires should make the process of gathering feedback for your public involvement activity easier for you to implement directly, without spending contract dollars. These questionnaires provide an easy way to get useful feedback from participants about their CAG experience. This feedback should help you to better understand whether a particular CAG is working out well, whether you are missing opportunities for improvement, or whether you need to address certain problems. Once you have summarized the data, Agency staff can assess whether they met goals, make modifications, and compare progress over time.

#### When should I use the questionnaires?

You can use the *first and second questionnaires* after every meeting or every couple of meetings. Use the *third and fourth questionnaires* once or twice a year, depending on the level of activity of the CAG. The questionnaires may also be helpful in situations where a particular problem hinders the successful working of the group. It is ultimately up to you, however, to decide when to use them. The key is to use the questionnaires to the extent that they provide you with valuable information and improve your ability to design and implement more effective listening sessions in the future.

#### Are the questionnaires in compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act?

Yes.. The *questionnaires* were cleared with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under ICR #2151.01, OMB Control No: 2010-0039. This clearance will allow EPA to collect information (via the questionnaires) from more than nine non-federal entities.

#### Who designed these questionnaires?

The Evaluation Task Group of EPA's Public Involvement Workgroup designed these questionnaires after consulting with EPA staff who are regularly involved in working with Community Advisory Groups.

#### What should Ido when preparing to administer a questionnaire?

See "Checklist for Administering the Questionnaire."

#### What do I do with the questionnaire data once the forms are returned?

As soon as you can, record and tabulate the responses you receive to each question on each survey in a format that works for you. Include the date, location, total number of respondents and which survey you used on the form. After each use of the same survey, check the past results so you can track improvement in the respondents' ratings.

On an annual basis, EPA must report use of the surveys to the Office of Management and Budget. Just before Thanksgiving, send a summary of your use of all the surveys to: bonner.patricia@epa.gov. Please note all the surveys used, the number of times you administered each, and the total number of respondents to each survey. If you have seen improved ratings, add a note about what you changed and what difference it made in not only the rating, but the activity itself. That way we will be able to track the use of the questionnaires, and learn from you what is and is not working well, and gauge whether and how the questionnaires are useful to your efforts to improve public involvement activities. If you have suggestions for additional surveys or changes to existing surveys, send those along too.

When it becomes available, you may collect, collate and analyze the data from the respondent forms using a pre-formatted Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet program. In addition, the spreadsheet program will allow you to summarize data over a period of time, making it easy to generate annual summary reports for your management. More information on how to use the program is available in the "Checklist for Administering the Questionnaire and Using Results" and within the Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet program.

#### How can I use the results?

The completed questionnaires should provide you with information that can help you design improvements to activities and to your overall involvement process. You can learn what worked well, what participants feel is important and what should change to better accommodate their needs. It will be up to you to decide how much data you need to prompt changes. While it is prudent to be cautious about making changes based upon a small amount of feedback data, you may find a number of the respondents' ideas useful. If you can act on their suggestions, even in a small way, participants will appreciate that you listened.

#### How should I communicate the results?

Use the performance and summary reports from the Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet program to talk with managers, staff, and CAG members about the effectiveness of CAG meetings and CAGs overall and where changes may be necessary. Communicate overall results to CAG participants in the CAG performance report or other follow-up materials distributed to CAG participants. A few brief sentences describing overall what participants thought of the CAG, their suggestions for improvement, and what might be considered to improve the CAG process would let participants know that you valued their input.

#### What is EPA's Public Involvement Policy and where can I get more information?

EPA's 2003 Public Involvement Policy underscores EPA's commitment to improving its practices and is based on seven steps for effective public involvement:

- 1. Plan and budget for public involvement activities
- 2. Identify the interested and affected public
- 3. Consider providing technical or financial assistance to the public to facilitate involvement
- 4. Provide information and outreach to the public

- 5. Conduct public consultation and involvement activities
- 6. Review and use input, and provide feedback to the public
- 7. Evaluate public involvement activities

The Framework for Implementing EPA's Public Involvement Policy urges development of tools to improve public involvement information sharing, training and evaluation at EPA. This questionnaire and the database program are examples of such tools. Cross-agency work groups developed the Policy and Framework using public comments and ideas gathered through a two-week, Internet-based Dialogue on Public Involvement in EPA Decisions. Copies of the Policy and Framework are available @ http://www.epa.gov/publicinvolvement/public/index.htm.

### Assessing EPA's Public Involvement Activities Checklist for Administering the Questionnaire and Using Results<sup>1</sup>

Review questionnaires. Determine whether a questionnaire should be administered. Determine what questionnaire(s) should be administered. Identify one person to be responsible for coordinating the overall dissemination and collection of the questionnaire and to input the data into the Lotus 1-2-3 data input, analysis, and reporting program once the questionnaires are collected. Make plans to include the questionnaire feedback process in the agenda of your public involvement event. Specifically, plan to set aside a few minutes before the conclusion of your public involvement event and have participants fill out their questionnaires. You should also plan to make an announcement at the beginning of your public involvement event explaining the questionnaire feedback process and how feedback is needed from all participants in order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the overall effectiveness of the event and how best to make improvements. Feedback is needed from participants who leave early and those who stay to the end. If you don't build the questionnaire feedback process directly into your event, and instead wait to the very end, chances are few participants will take the time to fill out their questionnaires. Participants may suggest that they would prefer to fill out their questionnaires at home or work. While this option is appealing for participants, chances are only a few will take the time to actually do this. The best chance for good feedback is when participants are actually at the event. Take the time to plan for this! Estimate the number of participants who will be attending the public involvement event for which questionnaires will be distributed. Make appropriate number of copies of the questionnaire. Bring questionnaire copies and extra pens or pencils to the public involvement event. Identify official who will be responsible for physically collecting the questionnaires. Clearly identify areas where participants should return their questionnaires. Hand out questionnaires with other public involvement activity materials either at the beginning of the event, or at a designated time during the event. Make it very clear to participants to whom, or to where, they should return their questionnaire. Urge participants to fill out their questionnaire even if they need to leave early. Identify the total number of participants attending (e.g., the total number of persons who could possibly fill out questionnaires). Recording Responses -- For now, collect questionnaires and record responses in a tabular

format that works for you. Include the date, location, total number of respondents and which

survey you used on the form.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Note: The instructions above are designed primarily for questionnaires that seek the perspective of participants about the effectiveness of a single event. Depending upon the type of questionnaire you wish to distribute and the type of public involvement activity you wish to acquire feedback for, you will need to tailor the steps of this checklist accordingly.

On an annual basis, EPA must report use of the surveys to the Office of Management and Budget. Just before Thanksgiving, send a summary of your use of all the surveys to: bonner.patricia@epa.gov. Please note all the surveys used, the number of times you administered each, and the total number of respondents to each survey. If you have seen improved ratings, add a note about what you changed and what difference it made in not only the rating, but the activity itself. That way we will be able to track the use of the questionnaires, and learn from you what is and is not working well, and gauge whether and how the questionnaires are useful to your efforts to improve public involvement activities. If you have suggestions for additional surveys or changes to existing surveys, send those along too.

When it becomes available to you, input data into the Lotus 1-2-3 data input, analysis, and reporting program within one month of session and share results.

Detach the Lotus 1-2-3 program onto your computer.<sup>2</sup>

Open the Lotus 1-2-3 program.

Click on the "Getting Started" tab and follow the instructions.

Review performance report and identify whether certain changes should be considered in preparation for the next public involvement event.

Use the Lotus 1-2-3 performance reports to talk with managers and staff about the effectiveness of your public involvement activity and where changes may be necessary.

Sharing data...EPA's Public Involvement Staff encourages you to send your completed Lotus 1-2-3 program files as e-mail attachments to: bonner.patricia@epa.gov. If you do so, Staff will be able to track the use of the questionnaires, learn from you what is and is not working well, and gauge whether and how the questionnaire was useful to your efforts to improve public involvement activities. We will not use the information you send to judge the strength of individual public involvement efforts. This data sharing could eliminate the need for summary annual reporting for OMB.

Communicate overall results and what changes you intend to make to participants who attended your last public involvement event in the public involvement event summary report or other follow-up materials distributed to participants. A few brief sentences describing overall what participants thought of the event, their suggestions for improvement, and what you will do to improve the next event would let participants know that you valued their input.

When you conduct another public involvement event, repeat the same steps listed above. However, after doing this, if you used a spreadsheet, be sure to go to the same Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet and follow the steps required to link the data from your first public involvement event to your second in order to summarize and compare your data over a period of time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Note: Separate Lotus 1-2-3 programs will be developed to match most types of questionnaires available (e.g., one for single event effectiveness for participants, one for overall effectiveness for participants, etc.). Be sure to use the appropriate Lotus 1-2-3 program to input your data.

OMB CONTROL NO: 2010-0039 EXPIRATION DATE: 01/31/2008

## Questionnaire for Feedback on the Overall Effectiveness of a Community Advisory Group Process Participant Assessment

#### Background

This questionnaire is designed to help Agency staff better understand the overall effectiveness of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) process. Agency staff will use this information to better understand what is working well and what improvements could be make this CAG process more successful. Thanks in advance for taking time to fill out the questionnaire. We value your input!

<u>Directions</u> Rate the following statements on a scale from 1-7 as write your own opinion to questions in the space provided. If you have no opinion, circle the number representing "Don't know." Please return your questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.	nd S <sup>M<sup>C</sup></sup>	ndly disa	igles Gold	gunat dis	solice of police	ge en	ordy agise port thorn
Committee membership is inclusive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All committee members are contributing to and sharing in the work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Committee is adequately connected to the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meeting frequency is appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Committee has a good process for reaching closure on issues.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Committee is fulfilling its chartered mission.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Committee is producing useful action agenda and recommendations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Committee is influencing EPA decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Personal participation is worthwhile.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Please provide any comments or suggestions for imp	rovin	g this	CAG	proce	ess: _		

Please indicate which group you represent:
neighborhood group
local non-profit organization (not including local neighborhood non-profit groups)
national environmental organization
business or industry or trade association
state or tribal or local government
federal government
other (please specify)
no organizational affiliation (e.g., interested local resident)

Please return your completed questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.

Thank you for helping EPA improve its public involvement practices.

**Burden Statement:** The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.158 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

#### Questionnaire for Feedback on the Effectiveness of a Community Advisory Group Meeting Participant Assessment

#### Background

This questionnaire is designed to help Agency staff better understand what worked well and what improvements to consider implementing before holding future Community Advisory Group (CAG) meetings. Once the data are summarized, Agency staff can assess whether goals for success were met, make modifications if necessary, and compare progress over time. Thanks in advance for taking time to fill out the questionnaire. We value your input!

#### Directions Rate the following statements on a scale from 1-7 and write your own opinion to questions in the space provided. If you have no opinion, circle the number representing "Don't know." Please return your questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave. Meeting objectives were a) clear b) achieved Meeting was run effectively. Sufficient technical information was available. Participants were able to influence meeting outcome. Participation in meeting was worthwhile. EPA participation was useful. Meeting time was convenient. Meeting location was comfortable. Meeting length was appropriate. Do you have any comments or suggestions for improving the CAG meetings?

Please indicate which group you represent:	
neighborhood group	
local non-profit organization (not including local neighborhood non-profit groups)	
national environmental organization	
business or industry or trade association	
state or tribal or local government	
federal government	
other (please specify)	
no organizational affiliation (e.g., interested local resident)	

Please return your completed questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.

Thank you for helping EPA improve its public involvement practices.

**Burden Statement:** The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.158 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

OMB CONTROL NO: 2010-0039 EXPIRATION DATE: 01/31/2008

## Questionnaire for Feedback on the Overall Effectiveness of a Community Advisory Group Process EPA/Contractor Assessment

#### Background

This questionnaire is designed to obtain an EPA/contractor perspective on the overall effectiveness of a CAG process. Agency staff will use this information to better understand what is working well and what improvements could be make this CAG process more successful. Thanks in advance for taking time to fill out the questionnaire. We value your input!

#### **Directions** Rate the following statements on a scale from 1-7 and write your own opinion to questions in the space provided. If you have no opinion, circle the number representing "Don't know." Please return your questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave. CAG is inclusive. CAG is well-facilitated. CAG has two way communication with community. CAG is producing useful advice. EPA is providing adequate technical information and support. EPA is providing appropriate financial and other assistance. Please explain your ranking of the previous statement about success:\_\_\_\_ Please provide any comments or suggestions for improving this CAG process:

Please return your completed questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.

Thank you for helping EPA improve its public involvement practices.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to

average 0.158 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.

OMB CONTROL NO: 2010-0039 EXPIRATION DATE: 01/31/2008

#### Questionnaire for Feedback on the Effectiveness of a **Community Advisory Group Meeting** EPA/Contractor Assessment

#### **Background**

This questionnaire is designed to obtain an EPA/contractor perspective on the effectiveness of a Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting or set of meetings. Agency staff will use this information to better understand what is working well and what improvements could make future CAG meetings more successful. Thanks in advance for taking time to fill out the questionnaire. We value your input!

#### **Directions**

Rate the following statements on a scale from 1-7 and

Rate the following statements on a scale from 1-7 ar write your own opinion to questions in the space provided. If you have no opinion, circle the number representing "Don't know." Please return your questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.		udh dies	oje <sup>e</sup> Got	lenhat dis	sadice of policy	3° 54	on Dorithron
Meeting objectives were							
a) clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b) achieved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meeting was run effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Sufficient technical information was available.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Participants were able to influence meeting outcome.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
EPA participation was useful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meeting time was convenient.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meeting location was comfortable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Meeting length was appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Please explain your ranking of the previous statement about success:							

Please provide any comments or suggestions for improving the CAG meetings:					

Please return your completed questionnaire to an EPA official before you leave.

Thank you for helping EPA improve its public involvement practices.

Burden Statement: The annual public reporting and recordkeeping burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 0.158 hours per response. Burden means the total time, effort, or financial resources expended by persons to generate, maintain, retain, or disclose or provide information to or for a Federal agency. This includes the time needed to review instructions; develop, acquire, install, and utilize technology and systems for the purposes of collecting, validating, and verifying information, processing and maintaining information, and disclosing and providing information; adjust the existing ways to comply with any previously applicable instructions and requirements; train personnel to be able to respond to a collection of information; search data sources; complete and review the collection of information; and transmit or otherwise disclose the information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control numbers for EPA's regulations are listed in 40 CFR part 9 and 48 CFR chapter 15.